

III. REMARKS

Claims 1-12 are pending in this application. By this Amendment, claims 3-4 and 6-9 have been amended. Applicants do not acquiesce in the correctness of the rejection and the objection and reserve the right to present specific arguments regarding any rejected claims not specifically addressed. Further, Applicants reserve the right to pursue the full scope of the subject matter of the original claims in a subsequent patent application that claims priority to the instant application. Reconsideration in view of the following remarks is respectfully requested.

In the Office Action, claims 4 and 6-12 are objected to under 37 CFR 1.75(c) as being in improper form because multiple dependent claim 4 does not treat its dependencies in the singular. By this Amendment, claims 3-4 and 6-9 are amended to resolve this condition. As such, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the objection.

In the Office Action, claims 1-3 and 9-12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Kikinis (U.S. Patent No. 5,794,259), hereafter “Kikinis,” in view of Ashlin Weekly Update, April 3, 1999, downloaded from [http://www.ashlin.ca/news/ HTML/ 19990403.htm](http://www.ashlin.ca/news/HTML/19990403.htm), hereinafter “Ashlin”; and claims 4-8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Kikinis and Ashlin, and further in view of Bhatia et al. (US Publication No. 2002/0154162), hereafter “Bhatia.” Applicants respectfully traverse the rejections for the reasons stated below.

With respect to independent claim 1, Applicants submit that the suggested combination of the cited references does not disclose or suggest, *inter alia*, “upon determination (51) that said requested information data is not stored in the buffer memory allocated to the program component in the network client, the program component obtaining (57) the requested data by downloading

(53, 55, 57) the requested data from the network server and filling (59) the dedicated form fields in the hypertext document with the downloaded information data[.]” (Claim 1). The Office admits that Kikinis does not disclose or suggest this feature (*see* Office Action at page 3), and relies on Ashlin to overcome this deficiency of Kikinis. Applicants submit that Ashlin also does not disclose or suggest this feature because Ashlin does not disclose or suggest the personal proxy downloads the requested data from the network server and fills the dedicated form fields with the downloaded information data. The personal proxy of Ashlin may only fill the form fields with the stored information (that is specified to be available to others) in the intercepted forms. Ashlin does not disclose that the personal proxy downloads information from the network server to fill in the intercepted forms in the case that the requested data is not available from the stored information. As such, the suggested combination of Kikinis and Ashlin does not render the claimed invention obvious. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejections.

In the current Office Action, the Office repeats the rejection as in the previous Office Action of 4/26/06, but provides clarified explanation to indicate the use of browser cache and reload function, as well as the reference material of a cache. Applicants appreciate this clarification. However, Applicants submit that the addition of the browser cache and the reload function does not overcome the above discussed deficiency of Kikinis and Ashlin. Even if Kikinis includes a browser cache and a reload function, Kikinis can only obtain an updated internet form. The browser cache and reload function cannot download information that is requested to fill the dedicated form fields in the internet form because the updated internet form do not include the requested information either. As such, even if the updated internet form is intercepted by Ashlin, Kikinis and Ashlin still cannot download the requested information from internet and fill the

dedicated form fields in the updated internet form. In view of the foregoing, Kikinis and Ashlin do not make the claimed invention obvious.

The dependent claims are believed allowable for the same reasons stated above, as well as for their own additional features. Applicants submit that Bhatia does not overcome the deficiencies of Kikinis and Ashlin. In view of the foregoing, the Office fails to establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness, and Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejections.

In light of the above, Applicants respectfully submits that all claims are in condition for allowance. Should the Examiner require anything further to place the application in better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact Applicants' undersigned representative at the number listed below.

Respectfully submitted,

/Hunter E. Webb/

Date: 4/10/2007

Hunter E. Webb
Reg. No.: 44,593
(JZ)

Hoffman, Warnick & D'Alessandro LLC
75 State Street, 14th Floor
Albany, New York 12207
(518) 449-0044
(518) 449-0047 (fax)